

interests than at any time in the history of the global economy.

If we didn't have diplomats in Asia and Latin America to help stem the flow of drugs to our shores, imagine how much harder that task would be. In Northern Ireland and the Middle East, if we didn't have people representing us, it would be a lot harder to move the peace process forward. In Burundi or Rwanda, if we didn't have brave people there, like Ambassador Bob Krueger, it would be even harder to avoid human tragedy. We don't need half-strength and part-time diplomacy in a world of fast-moving opportunities and 24-hour-a-day crises.

The last point I want to make is this. There are people who say, "Oh, Mr. President, I am for a strong America. I just don't understand why you fool with the U.N. What we need is for America to stand up alone. We'll decide what the right thing to do is and do it. Let the rest of the world like it or lump it. That's what it means to be the world's only superpower." That also is a disguised form of isolationism.

Unilateralism in the world that we live in is not a viable option. When our vital interests are at stake, of course, we might have to act alone. But we need the wisdom to work with the United Nations and to pay our bills. We need the flexibility to build coalitions that spread the risk and responsibility and the cost of leadership, as President Bush did in Desert Storm and we did in Haiti.

If the past 50 years have taught us anything, it is that the United States has a unique responsibility and a unique ability to be a force for peace and progress around the world, while building coalitions of people that can work together in genuine partnership.

But we can only succeed if we continue to lead. Our purpose has to be the same in this new era as it has ever been. Whatever our political persuasions, I believe we all share the same goals. I think we want a future where people all over the world know the benefits of democracy; in which our own people can live their lives free from fear; in which our sons and daughters won't be called to fight in wars that could have been prevented; in which people no longer flee tyranny in their own countries to come to our shores; in which markets are open to our products and services, where they give our own people good, high-wage jobs; a country in which we know an unparalleled amount of peace and prosperity because we have fulfilled a traditional American mandate of the 20th century well into the 21st, because we, we, have led the world toward democracy and freedom, toward peace and prosperity.

If we want the kind of future I described, we have to assume the burden of leadership. There is simply not another alternative. So I ask you, bring your passion to this task, bring your argument to this task, and bring the sense of urgency that has animated this country in its times of greatest challenge for the last 50 years to this task.

The future, I believe, will be even brighter for the American people than the last 50 years if, if, we can preserve our leadership in pursuit of our values.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:37 a.m. at the Hyatt Regency Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to Adrian Karatnycky, president, Freedom House, and Representative Robert Livingston.

Statement on Reform of Computer Export Controls

October 6, 1995

Today I am pleased to announce a major reform of our computer export controls that will adjust to the global spread of technology while preserving our vital national security interests.

Effective export controls are a critical part of national security, especially a strong non-proliferation policy. Our control regulations must focus principally on exports that have significant

national security applications and which are not so widely available in open commerce that controls are ineffective.

When I came into office, virtually all computers more powerful than a basic desktop required an export license from the Government, even

though many of these machines could be purchased in electronics stores from Hong Kong to Frankfurt as well as in cities across America. Both the U.S. Government and American exporters spent millions of dollars and thousands of hours implementing and complying with a tangled web of export control regulations.

Two years ago, to bring our export control system into line with new developments in computer technology and the changing nature of the threats to our national security, I relieved billions of dollars worth of exports from outdated and unnecessary controls and instructed my administration thoroughly and periodically to review the controls on computer exports. The purpose of this review was to determine how changes in computer technology and its military applications should affect our export control regulations.

Now, in the wake of a careful reevaluation by the Department of Defense, I have instructed my administration to update our controls to ensure that computers that could have a significant military impact on U.S. and allied security interests remain carefully controlled, while controls that are unnecessary or ineffective are eliminated.

Specifically, I have decided to eliminate controls on the export of all computers to countries in North America, most of Europe, and parts of Asia. For a number of other countries, including many in Latin America and Central and Eastern Europe, we will ease but not eliminate computer export controls. For the former Soviet Union, China, and a number of other countries, we will focus our controls on computers intended for military end uses or users, while easing them on the export of computers to civilian

customers. Finally, we will continue to deny computer technology to terrorist countries around the world.

This decision will relieve U.S. computer manufacturers of unnecessary and ineffective regulations which often have tied their hands while foreign competitors won major contracts or built their own systems. It will help preserve the strength of the U.S. computer industry, which also is key to our national security. It is good for U.S. workers and U.S. business.

This decision will benefit our national security in a number of other ways. Trying to regulate the export of computers that are increasingly available in markets abroad is a recipe for an ineffective nonproliferation policy. It imposes serious regulatory burdens without improving our national security and diverts resources from the pursuit of other important nonproliferation objectives.

Today's action will strengthen our nonproliferation policy by targeting our export control resources on those areas where they can make a difference. It will complement our work in the New Forum, the multilateral regime we are forming to control arms and sensitive dual-use technologies, where we will work with our partners to encourage development of multilateral transparency and controls on computers consistent with our national controls. It will reinforce other steps we have taken in this administration to achieve concrete goals—such as the indefinite extension of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, denuclearization of Ukraine, stopping the North Korean nuclear weapons program, and a negotiation of a comprehensive test ban—in our efforts to combat proliferation.

Memorandum on Absence of Federal Employees in the Aftermath of Hurricane Opal

October 6, 1995

Memorandum for the Heads of Executive Departments and Agencies

Subject: Excused Absence for Employees Affected by Hurricane Opal and Its Aftermath

I am deeply concerned about the devastating losses caused by Hurricane Opal and the impact

on the well-being and livelihood of our fellow Americans who have been affected by this disaster. Elements of the Federal Government have been mobilized to respond to this disaster.

As part of this effort, I request the heads of executive departments and agencies who have Federal civilian employees in the areas des-